



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/800,139	03/06/2001	Andreas Maier	DE920000020US1	4166

7590 03/19/2004

William A. Kinnaman, Jr.
IBM Corporation
2455 South Road (M/S P386)
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601

EXAMINER

DAS, CHAMELI

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2122

DATE MAILED: 03/19/2004

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

h

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/800,139

Applicant(s)

MAIER ET AL.

Examiner

C.DAS

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14-23, 25, 27 and 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 13, 24, 26 and 29 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2122

1. Claims 1-29 are pending.
2. Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C 119(a)-(d) or (f). No certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 22 is objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 22, line 27 a period is missing at the end of the sentence. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-8, 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motoyama et al, (Motoyama), US 6,009,436 and further in view of the background section of Motoyama.

Regarding claim 1, Motoyama discloses:

-a conversion method for allowing conversion of data into another encoding scheme (col 2 lines 52-57, col 3 lines 1-10, col 4 lines 55-57)

- an encoding scheme identifier for identifying an encoding scheme of said data (col 27, lines 36-45)
- a conversion flag (Motoyama, col 8 lines 48-52, col 9 lines 21-30, col 3 lines 1-25) and (col 21, lines 44-55).

Motoyama does not specifically disclose *automatic* conversion. However, the background section discloses the *automatic* conversion (col 2 lines 42-45). The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide as much automation as possible to reduce the work load on the developer and thus make the system easier to use.

Regarding claim 2, Motoyama discloses:

- attribute information is added to said data (col 3 lines 57-65, col 14 lines 15-20).

Regarding claim 3, Motoyama discloses:

- attribute information is added to a directory of said data (col 3 lines 57-65, col 14 lines 15-20, col 28 lines 6-15, col 28 lines 26-30).

Regarding claim 4, Motoyama discloses:

- data comprises a file (col 4 lines 42-45, col 28 lines 5-10).

Regarding claim 5, (Motoyama, col 5 lines 6-7, col 15 lines 25-40).

Regarding claim 6, (Motoyama, col 15 lines 25-40).

Regarding claim 7, (Motoyama, col 15 lines 25-50).

Regarding claim 8, (Motoyama, col 11 lines 25-40), where the output is used as input of the other clearly shows the data comprises a pipe.

Regarding claim 11, (Motoyama, abstract lines 19-28, col 7 lines 42-52).

Regarding claim 12, (Motoyama, col 8 lines 47-54).

Regarding claim 13, (Motoyama, abstract lines 19-28).

Regarding claim 14, (Motoyama, col 8 lines 48-52, col 9 lines 21-30, col 3 lines 1-25) and (col 21, lines 44-55).

6. Claims 9-10, 15-21 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motoyama et al, (Motoyama), US 6,009,436 and further in view of "Microsoft Computer Dictionary", published on 1997.

Regarding claim 9, Motoyama discloses services in network. Motoyama does not specifically disclose *socket*. However, computer dictionary teaches *sockets* in the network (page 440 and page 441, "socket"). The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to identify a particular service on a particular node on a network.

Regarding claim 10, Motoyama discloses data comprises a message (Motoyama, col 5 lines 19-21, col 12 lines 21-23). Motoyama does not specifically disclose *message queue*. However, computer dictionary teaches *message queue* (page 305, "message queue"). The modification would be obvious because one of the

Art Unit: 2122

ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide a very efficient and reliable transport mechanism.

Regarding claim 15, (Motoyama, col 24 lines 10-25, col 24 lines 61- col 25, lines 1-10, col 15 lines 9-16).

Regarding claim 16, (Motoyama, col 26 lines 57-65, col 27 lines 22-35).

Regarding claim 17, (Motoyama, col 26 lines 57-65, col 27 lines 22-35).

Regarding claim 18, (Motoyama, col 15 lines 9-15)

Regarding claim 19, (Motoyama, abstract, lines 25-28, col 9 lines 21-30).

Regarding claim 20, (Motoyama, col 8 lines 48-52, col 9 lines 21-30, col 3 lines 1-25) and (col 21, lines 44-55).

For automatic conversion, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 21, (Motoyama, col 21 lines 26-55).

Regarding claim 27, (Motoyama, col 14 lines 4-12).

7. Claims 22-23, 25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Motoyama et al, (Motoyama), US 6,009,436 and further in view of Mitchell et al (Mitchell, US 5,497,491)

Regarding claim 22, determining the status of the conversion flag based on heuristic rules (Motoyama, col 63-66, col 4 lines 1-7, col 7 lines 63-67, col 8 lines 1-10)

- deriving a file encoding scheme identifier... settings (Motoyama, abstract, lines 25-28, col 1 lines 20-32)

Art Unit: 2122

- converting said data into said other encoding scheme ... conversion

(Motoyama, col 8 lines 48-52, col 9 lines 21-30, col 3 lines 1-25) and (col 21, lines 44-55).

Regarding claim 22, Motayama does not specifically disclose creating virtual attribute information for data having no attribute information ... at runtime. However, Mitchellle discloses creating virtual attribute information for data having no attribute information ... at runtime (Mitchelle, abstract, col 2 lines 49-60), (Mitchelle, col 9 lines 43-50, col 10 lines 8-10). The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to save the space in the storage.

For automatic conversion, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 23, (Mitchelle, col 2 lines 48-55, col 5 lines 52-65, col 10 lines 22-24, col 9 lines 48-52).

Regarding claim 25, (Motoyama, col 5 lines 5-7).

Regarding claim 28, (Motoyama, col 3 lines 58-61, col 2 lines 52-57, col 3 lines 1-10, col 4 lines 55-57).

Motoyama does not specifically disclose *automatic* conversion. However, the background section discloses the *automatic* conversion (col 2 lines 42-45). The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide as much automation as possible to reduce the work load on the developer and thus make the system easier to use.

Motoyama does not specifically disclose allocating virtual attribute information to data having no attribute information. However, Mitchell discloses allocating virtual attribute information to data having no attribute information (Mitchelle, col 9 lines 43-50, col 10 lines 8-10). The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to save the space in the storage.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 13, 24, 26 and 29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. The prior art made or record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

TITLE: Method and apparatus for providing a graphical user interface for creating and editing a mapping of a first structural description to a second structural description, US 6678867 B2

TITLE: Apparatus and method for revising computer program code, US 5956510 A

TITLE: Method and system for transparently transforming objects for application programs, US 6230310 B1

TITLE: Method for comparing attribute values of controllable object expressions in a network element, US 5941978 A

TITLE: File system primitive providing native file system support for remote storage, US

Art Unit: 2122

5978815 A

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chameli Das whose telephone number is 703-305-1339.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 A.M. to 3:30 P.M. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Tuan Dam can be reached at 703-305-4552. The fax number for this group is (703) 872-9306.

An inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9600.


CHAMELI C. DAS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit 2122

3/18/04